



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/698,693	10/27/2000	Jose Gabriel Menchero	VTEK-110	5993
27872	7590	01/17/2006	EXAMINER	
GIRARD & EQUITZ LLP 400 MONTOGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1110 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104			NGUYEN, NGA B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3628	

DATE MAILED: 01/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/698,693	MENCHERO, JOSE GABRIEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nga B. Nguyen	3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 5,6,10-13 and 16-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 5,6,10-13 and 16-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is the answer to the Amendment filed on August 15, 2005, which paper has been placed of record in the file.
2. Claims 5, 6, 10-13, and 16-19 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments/Amendment

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5, 6, 10-13, and 16-19 have been considered but are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument regarding to claims 5, 6, 10-13, and 16-19, examiner submits that although Maggioncalda, U.S. Patent No. 5,918,217 fails to disclose performing an arithmetic performance attribution computation in a specific way, including by determining coefficients of a specifically recited type, and determining portfolio relative performance at a specific way using these coefficients, but Maggioncalda's computer system and computer readable medium is capable of performing an arithmetic performance attribution computation and displaying a result of the arithmetic performance attribution computation. Therefore, it is obvious that Maggioncalda's computer system and computer readable medium is capable of performing an arithmetic performance attribution computation in a specific way, including by determining coefficients of a specifically recited type, and determining portfolio relative performance at a specific way using these coefficients.

In conclusion, for the reason set forth above, examiner decides to maintain the previous rejection and make this Office action FINAL.

4. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5, 6, 10-13, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maggioncalda et al (hereinafter Maggioncalda), U.S. Patent No. 5,918,217.

Regarding to claims 5, 6, 10-13, and 16-19, Maggioncalda discloses a computer system and computer readable medium, comprising:

a processor programmed to perform an arithmetic performance attribution computation to determine portfolio performance (figure 2, processor 202; column 6, lines 25-42);

a display device coupled to the processor arithmetic performance attribution computation for displaying a result of the arithmetic performance attribution computation (figure 1, display 221; column 6, lines 45-55).

Examiner submits that the claimed invention recites an intended use, although Maggioncalda fails to discuss the intended use which is to perform an arithmetic performance attribution computation in a specific way, including by determining coefficients of a specifically recited type, and determining portfolio relative performance at a specific way using these coefficients, Maggioncalda's computer system is capable of performing an arithmetic performance attribution computation and displaying a result of the arithmetic performance attribution computation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maggioncalda's to include the feature above for the purpose of performing an arithmetic performance attribution computation in a specific way, determining portfolio relative performance at a specific way and displaying a result of the arithmetic performance attribution computation.

"The recitation of a new intended use for an old product does not make a claim to that old product patentable." *In re Schreiber*, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Conclusion

7. Claims 5, 6, 10-13, and 16-19 are rejected.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Nga B. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6796. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:00AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung S. Sough can be reached on (571) 272-6799.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-1113.

9. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
C/o Technology Center 3600
Washington, DC 20231

Or faxed to:


(571) 273-8300 (for formal communication intended for entry),
or
(571) 273-0325 (for informal or draft communication, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Knox building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA, First Floor (Receptionist).

Application/Control Number: 09/698,693
Art Unit: 3628

Page 6

Nga B. Nguyen

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nga Nguyen".

November 25, 2005